DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 072 386 CG 007 779

AUTHOR Goldberg, Philip A.
TITLE Prejudice Toward Women: Some Personality Correlates.
PUB DATE Sep 72
NOTE 18p.; Paper presented at the American Psychological Association Convention, September, 1972, Honolulu, Hawaii

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Bias; *Discriminatory Attitudes (Social); Females; Individual Characteristics; Individual Psychology; Males; Personality; *Personality Assessment; Projective Tests; *Psychometrics; Research Projects; *Sex Discrimination; Social Attitudes; Tests
IDENTIFIERS Berger Self Esteem Scale; California F Scale; Goldberg Misogyny Test; Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory; Rotter Incomplete Sentence Blank

ABSTRACT

This research sought to determine what personality characteristics are associated with prejudice toward women, and given the reality of such characteristics, what is the functional, personal value of this prejudice. This paper reports on the results of a series of correlational studies intended to answer these questions using a variety of psychometric devices with a variety of subject population. The devices include the California F Scale, the Goldberg Misogyny Test, a Sex-Role Stereotype Questionnaire, the Minnesota, Multiphasic Personality Inventory, the Rotter Incomplete Sentence Blank, and the Berger Self-Esteem Scale. Research conducted does reveal some personality differences which exist between high and low misogynous subjects; however, the list of variables that did not discriminate significantly between high and low misogynous subjects is much lengthier than the list of variables that did discriminate. The author concludes that prejudice toward women is culturally fixed and an almost universal attitude and, as such, final explanations of the phenomenon are not profitably to be looked for at the level of individual psychology. References are included. (Author/SES)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 072586

Prejudice Toward Women: Some Personality Correlates

Philip A. Goldberg

Connecticut College

Previous research by Goldberg (1968) and by Pheterson, Kiesler and Goldberg (1971) provides both an objective demonstration of prejudicial attitudes toward women and a sensitive technique for assessing these attitudes. In the first study women were asked to make judgements about the quality of scholarly essays and in the second study women were asked to make judgements about the quality of contemporary paintings. In both studies the women subjects judged the work of men to be significantly better than the identical work of women.

It's a sexist world we live in, but that judgement could probably be made without the benefit of the findings of this research. There are two points made by the research that are, perhaps, worth noting. First, if one uses Allport's (1954) definition of prejudice, then these studies probably represent the first experimental demonstrations of prejudice toward women in the psychological literature. Much research has been done, of course, to demonstrate the negative stereotyping of women in our society (cf Kitay, 1940; McKee & Sherriffs, 1957; Sherriffs & McKee, 1957; Smith, 1939).

Paper presented at APA symposium: "Who Discriminates Against Women?", Hawaii, September, 1972

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

But negative stereotyping is one element of a prejudicial attitude and not sufficient in itself to establish the phenomenon of prejudice. The other element required is that the stereotype be contrary to the evidence of personal experience. By making the evaluative material (scholarly essays and contemporary paintings) identical and varying the sex of the author and painter, this second element was established.

The second point to note is that women were the subjects used in the research. Interestingly, in an unpublished study by Dorros and Follett (1969) Goldberg's (1968) original study was replicated using a sample of male college students; the results were, for this sample at least, that men maintain the same prejudice, but much less strongly.

That women, some women, share with men a common negative set of attitudes toward women seems well established and a good deal of research demonstrates how fundamental and pervasive these attitudes toward women are. Alper and Korchin (1952) tested male and female college students' ability to remember socially pertinent information, specifically, the admission of women to Harvard University. Alper and Korchin found that the women were more likely than the men to recall pro-male and anti-female items.

French and Lesser (1964) found that "women who value intellectual attainment feel they must reject the woman's role" (p. 128). Maslow, Rand and Newman (1960) discuss the consequences for women in a society that values masculinity more than it values femininity.

> "...this is as if they thought that the only way to be strong or capable or intelligent or successful were to be male. So also, following the same assumption, the woman in order to be a good female may feel it necessary to give up her strength, intelligence or talent, fearing them as somehow masculine and defeminizing."

Kate Millett (1970) in rejecting the significance of Freud's concept of penis envy says:

> "And here it would seem that girls are fully cognizant of male supremacy long before they see their brother's penis. It is so much a part of their culture, so entirely present in the favoritism of school and family, in the image of each sex presented to them by all media, religion, and in every model of the adult world they perceive, that to associate it with a boy's distinguishing genital would, since they have learned a thousand other distinguishing sexual marks by now, be either redundant or irrelevant. Confronted with so much concrete evidence of the male's superior status, sensing on all sides the depreciation in which they are held, girls envy not the penis, but only what the penis gives one social pretensions to." (Millett, 1970, p. 187)

Negative attitudes toward women, attitudes often shared by women with all their enervating consequences, are common, then, in our society. But, however common such attitudes might be, certainly

they are not universally held. And so the question posed by this symposium: "Who discriminates against women?" was essentially the question that guided the research we shall describe. The particular form of the question we tried to answer was: What are the personality characteristics associated with prejudice toward women, and given the reality of such characteristics, what is the functional, personal value of this prejudice.

This paper will report on the results of a series of correlational studies intended to answer these questions using a variety of psychometric devices with a variety of subject populations. Formal hypotheses as such were not offered. At a minimum, however, this series of studies made the simple assumption that those people who maintain negative attitudes toward women differ in a measurable way from those people who do not have such attitudes. Beyond that, the only other common assumption that we could identify was that we had selected likely ways to measure the assumed difference.

The F Scale

Since the early work of Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswik, Levinson, and Sanford (1950), the California F Scale, for all its lack of psychometric purity, has generated a host of theoretically as well as statistically significant correlations reinforcing the relationship presumed to exist between authoritarianism and ethnic prejudice.

In a study by Centers (1963) a shortened form of the California

F Scale correlated significantly with a misogyny scale devised by the author. Of interest in this study were two things that Centers did not find. One, a cluster of biographical variables did not correlate with his measure of misognynous attitudes; these variables were: age, education, race, socioeconomic status, social class identification, marital status, and occupation. Two, there was no difference between women and men in the correlation between authoritarianism as measured by the F Scale and misogyny.

In our research[1] the F Scale and the Goldberg Misogyny Test were given to groups of male naval officers and male civilians and yielded a somewhat complicated pattern of results. As expected the naval officers scored significantly higher on the California F Scale than the civilian group. Further, a Pearson product-moment coefficient of .37, significant at the .05 level, resulted for scores on the two scales.

But the groups did not differ significantly in degree of misogyny; both groups were misogynous as defined by the Goldberg Test. In summary, then, we find that though authoritarianism does correlate significantly with misogyny, the degree of the relationship is too low to be of much discriminatively predictive value.

n Power

"Expected sex roles... are based on hierarchical power relationships." (Mauch, 1972, p. 1) This was the assumption that guided our next correlational effort. Forty-three male college

students were given a series of six modified TAT pictures designed to provide a measure of power motivation (Winter, 1968) and a Sex-Role Stereotype Questionnaire (Broverman, Broverman, Clarkson, & Rosenkrantz, 1970).[2]

The Sex-Role Questionnaire consists of a series of bi-polar phrases which the subject is asked to identify as typically masculine or typically feminine. A sample of some of the bi-polar items:

very sneaky versus very direct

almost never acts as a leader versus always acts as a leader

not at all ambitious versus very ambitious

has difficulty making decisions versus can make decisions easily

If there are any doubts, it should be noted that in each instance it is the first bi-polar phrase which is the feminine stereotype. A Pearson product-moment correlation between the two instruments yielded $r = .61$, significant at the .01 level. This finding, that misogyny is related to the need for power in men, is entirely consistent with the dominant themes of the contemporary women's liberation literature.

The MMPI

Of all the tests available in psychology the MMPI is probably the most useful for a correlational fishing expedition, which admittedly was the nature and intent of our research. The test is a broad banded instrument which allows for the non-specific amassing of great batches of data.

The MMPI was given along with the Goldberg Misogyny Test to forty male undergraduate students.[3] On the basis of the Goldberg Test the subjects were categorized either as High or Low in misogyny. The following differences between Highs and Lows on the MMPI were obtained: The High misogyny group had a higher score on Scale 1 (Hypochondriasis), a higher score on scale 3 (Hysteria) and a higher score on scale 8 (Schizophrenia). The High misogyny group also scored significantly higher on the neurotic triad (the mean of scales one through three, often used as a measure of general neuroticism), and finally, the High misogyny group also scored higher on the Lie scale. All these differences were significant at the .05 level, except for the difference on scale 8, which was significant at the .10 level.

As Dahlstrom and Welsh (1960) caution, one does not make judgements about a subject by referring to the nominalisms at the top of his high point scales. Without attempting specific diagnostic statements, it is consistent with the data to say that the High misogyny group does show somewhat more profile elevation and a somewhat greater degree of general neuroticism.

Configuration of scores is generally regarded by MMPI experts as being more important than absolute elevation, unless the elevation is extreme, which it was not in our data. And the configuration of scale scores for the two groups was virtually identical. In short, the basic MMPI scales yielded some statistically significant differences between the two groups, but no differences of any obvious practical or theoretical significance.

One other MMPI dimension was examined; the two groups were compared on an expressive-repressive index devised by Sanford, Webster, and Freedman (1957). Given some widely held notions about the misogynist and his general up-tightness, this seemed a reasonable variable to examine.

On this index the High misogyny group does show some tendency to be more repressed and less expressive than the Low misogyny group. This significance requires some statistical stretching, the p value being very slightly above the 10 per cent level. Using a somewhat different MMPI procedure to measure a very similar variable, a sensitizer-repressor index devised by Altrocchi, Parsons, and Dickoff (1959), failed to generate significance for any remotely reasonable value of p. MMPI derived scales for ego strength (Barron, 1953), and for manifest anxiety (Taylor, 1953) also failed to produce significant differences between the two groups.

The Rotter Incomplete Sentences Blank

In reviews of the sentence completion method Goldberg (1965, 1968a) finds that it is a sensitive technique for the assessment of personality generally, and that the Rotter ISB has been a particularly useful instrument for making judgements about psychological adjustment.

The ISB was given along with the Goldberg Misogyny Test to two different samples of male and female high school seniors and college students.[4] On the misogyny test the results were as

follows: neither male group demonstrated a significant degree of misogyny, although there was some tendency toward misogyny short of conventional statistical significance. For the female groups, however, the results were very different. Both groups could be said to be misogynous, one of them strikingly so ($P < .10$ and $p < .01$).

Further analyses also yielded differences between the female and male subjects. We placed both the male and female groups into sub-groups of High and Low misogyny and calculated differences in their mean ISB scores. For those not familiar with the ISB, it is important to point out that the content of each of the responses to the 40 sentence stems is scored on a 7 point scale for degree of conflict. The scoring is guided by a manual of examples and scoring principles developed by Rotter and Rafferty (1950).

For the male group there was no statistically significant mean difference in ISB scores between High misogyny and Low misogyny groups. For the female subjects, however, the High misogynous group had a mean ISB score of 144 and the Low misogynous group had a mean ISB score of 131. The difference between these two means is significant at the .05 level. According to Rotter, Rafferty and Schachtitz (1949) a cutting score of 135 on the ISB sufficiently separates well adjusted subjects from maladjusted subjects. (The higher the score, the less well adjusted the subject.)

A qualitative examination of the responses to some of the critical stems is even more dramatic. One of the girls in the High misogyny group whose ISB score was 180 gave the following

responses to the stems "Boys..." and "Most girls...":

"Boys...are easier to talk to than girls."

"Most girls...are very boring to be with because they are offended by practically anything you say."

Another High misogyny girl with an ISB score of 170 gave the following responses to these stems:

"Boys...will be boys."

"Most girls...make one another miserable."

One other High misogyny girl with an ISB score below the cutting score (123) responded to the two stems thusly:

"Boys...are so much fun."

"Most girls...have lots of problems."

Given these qualitative differences we proceeded to examine the quantitative differences between the various groups on these stems, looked at individually. The results were significant, interesting, and entirely consistent with the impressions derived from a subjective inspection of the ISB records.

For the male group as a whole, there was no difference in conflict score between their responses to the two stems. No significant difference was obtained even when the male group was broken down into High and Low misogyny sub-groups. For the female group as a whole the results were very different. The mean score for the stem "Boys" was 2.37; the mean score for the stem "Most girls" was 4.13, the difference between the stems was essentially the same for both the Low as well as the High misogyny female groups. (A reminder, the higher the score, the greater the degree of conflict or maladjustment.)

Autobiographical Inventory and the Berger Self-Esteem Scale

The Berger Self-Esteem Scale (Berger, 1968) and the Goldberg Misogyny Test were given to 133 male high school students, juniors and seniors. The subjects were also asked to answer a series of questions about their personal history.[5] The results were quite simply disappointing. No findings of any particular interest emerged from these data. The autobiographical inventory was particularly disappointing. Though Centers (1963), as previously noted, found no significant relationship between his measure of misogyny and Baruch (1972) using the Goldberg Misogyny Test as the measure of misogyny also found little of interest with such biographical questions, the logic that a relationship between personal history and misogyny could be demonstrated was compelling. Unfortunately, the logic was more compelling than the data.

A Sexist Riddle

What we wish to report on now is probably best regarded as a demonstration. It is, we think, an important demonstration, wasteful and discouraging in its implications. Twenty-eight male and twenty-eight female college students were asked to solve the following riddle:

> "A father and his son were driving along the highway when the father suddenly lost control of the car and crashed into a telephone pole. The father was killed instantly and his son was badly

injured. The boy was rushed to the local hospital where it was found that he was suffering from serious internal injuries. A prominent surgeon was immediately summoned. When the surgeon arrived and went to the operating room to examine the boy, there was a gasp from the surgeon. 'I can't operate on this boy,' the surgeon said, 'He is my son'."

The subjects were asked to resolve the apparent paradox. The father was dead. How could the boy be the surgeon's son? Of course the answer is a simple one, there is no paradox, the surgeon is a woman, the surgeon is the boy's mother. Simple surely, but not apparently obvious for these subjects. Two male subjects and four female subjects had heard the riddle before. Of the remaining 26 males and 24 females, 3 males and 4 females were able to identify the surgeon as the boy's mother, the rest could not. Eighty-six per cent of these college students found this riddle too difficult to solve.

The source of the difficulty seems abundantly clear; surgeons are men and fathers, not women and mothers. Based on our sample, this set effect is as strong for women as it is for men.

Discussion

If we go back to the question around which this symposium is arranged, the answer to "Who discriminates against women?" might very well be "everybody...almost." Reviewing the data what have we found?

1. Misogynous men are more likely to be authoritarian.
2. Misogynous men are more likely to have a high need for power.
3. Misogynous men are perhaps more likely to be neurotic and perhaps more likely to be defensive about their shortcomings and perhaps more likely to be unexpressive emotionally. Perhaps.
4. Misogynous females seem to be maladjusted.
5. Females generally seem to have a good deal more conflict in their relative perceptions of men and women.
6. Both men and women, high in misogyny and low in misogyny seem strongly set to perceive women as incapable of functioning in prestige occupational positions.

And that's about it. Surely the list of variables that did not discriminate significantly between high and low misogynous subjects is a good deal longer than the list of variables that did discriminate. And what might that mean? There are at least two possibilities.

One, only a fool would try to make anything of no difference; it violates everything we tell our beginning students about the null hypothesis. Or two, in a world where everybody...almost shares a common attitude, the likelihood of finding someone who does not share in this attitude is probably smaller than the degree of error in the measuring device used to find such people. Under such conditions few significant correlations with the measure could be expected to be found.

If we are right, then, in our suggestion that sexism approaches being a culturally fixed and almost universal attitude, then it would seem that final explanations of the phenomenon are not profitably to be looked for at the level of individual psychology. Indeed, neither explanation nor solution is likely located there, although the price of sexism is paid for person by person.

Footnotes

1. Winifred Cockfield Collected these data.
2. Deidre Russell collected these data.
3. Donna Mauch collected these data.
4. Ariel Leshem and Enid Markowitz collected these data.
5. Ariel Leshem collected these data.

Adorno, T.W., Frenkel-Brunswik, Else, Levinson, D.J. & Sanford, R.N. The authoritarian personality. New York: Harper, 1950.

Allport, G.W. The nature of prejudice. Cambridge: Addison-Wesley, 1954.

Altrocchi, J., Parsons, O.A., & Dickoff, Hilda. Changes in self-ideal discrepancy in repressors and sensitizers. Unpublished manuscript, 1959.

Barron, F. An ego-strenth scale which predicts response to psychotherapy. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1953, 17, 327-333.

Baruch, Grace. Maternal influence upon college women's attitudes toward women and work. Journal of Developmental Psychology, 1972 (in press).

Berger, C.B. Sex differences related to self-esteem factor structure. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1968, 32, 442-446.

Broverman, I.K., Broverman, D.M., Clarkson, F. & Rosenkrantz, P. Sex role stereotypes and clinical judgements of mental health. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1970, 34, 1-7.

Centers, R., Authoritarianism and misogyny. Journal of Social Psychology, 1963, 61, 81-85.

Dahlstrom, W.G. & Welsh, G.S. (Eds.) An MMPI handbook. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1960.

Dorros, Karen & Follet, Jacqueline. Prejudice towards women as revealed by male college students. Unpublished manuscript, 1969.

French, Elizabeth, & Lesser, G.S. Some characteristics of the achievement motive in women. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1964, 68, 119-128.

Goldberg, P.A. A review of sentence completion methods in personality assessment. Journal of Projective Techniques and Personality Assessment, 1965, 29, 12-45.

Goldberg, P.A. Are women prejudiced against women? Transaction, April, 1968, 28-30.

Goldberg, P.A. The current status of sentence completion methods. Journal of Projective Techniques and Personality Assessment, 1968a, 32, 215-221.

Kitay, P.M. A comparison of the sexes in their attitudes and beliefs about women. Sociometry, 1940, 34, 399-407.

Maslow, A.H., Rand, H. & Newmann, S. Some parallels between sexual and dominance behavior of infra-human primates and the fantasies of patients in psychotherapy. Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease, 1960, 131, 202-212.

Mauch, Donna M. The need for power as a correlate of sex-role stereotyping in college males. Unpublished manuscript, 1972.

McKee, J.P. & Sherriffs, A.C. The differential evaluation of males and females. Journal of Personality, 1957, 25, 356-371.

Millett, Kate. Sexual politics, New York: Doubleday, 1970.

Pheterson, Gail I., Kiesler, Sara B., & Goldberg, P.A. Evaluation of the performance of women as a function of their sex, achievement, and personal history. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1971, 19, 114-118.

Rotter, J.B. & Rafferty, Janet, E. Manual: The Rotter incomplete sentences blank. New York: Psychological Corporation, 1950.

Rotter, J.B., Rafferty, Janet E., & Schachtitz, Eva. Validation of the Rotter incomplete sentences blank for college screening. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1949, 13, 348-356.

Sanford, N., Webster, H. & Freedman, M. Impulse expression as a variable of personality. Psychological Monograph, 1957, 71, (Whole No. 440).

Sherriffs, A.C. & McKee, J.P. Qualitative aspects of beliefs about men and women. Journal of Personality, 1957, 25, 452-464.

Smith, S. Age and sex differences in children's opinion concerning sex differences. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 1939, 54, 17-25.

Taylor, Janet A. A personality scale of manifest anxiety. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1953, 48, 285-290.

Winter, D.G. A revised scoring system for the need for power. Unpublished paper, Wesleyan University, 1968.